

The Review.

VOL. X.

ST. LOUIS, MO., JUNE 4, 1903.

No. 22.

A SIDELIGHT ON PHILIPPINE CONDITIONS.



R. JAMES A. LE ROY, a non-Catholic, writes in the N. Y. *Evening Post* of May 21st, in the course of a two-column article headed "Conditions in the Philippines":

"The word 'Katipunan' is still one to conjure with, whether among the ignorant masses of the Filipinos or, often, with the wilfully ignorant American newspaper writers of Manila. Secret societies have been the order of the day over there since 1895, for three years after which the real Katipunan had moral support among the best of the Filipinos. Every little while, particularly in the back districts, some person or persons organize an oath-bound society for the purpose of preying on the easily frightened and credulous masses and making them pay their pittances each month to fatten the pockets of the conspirators. From 1901 on, these blackmailing organizations have constantly been unearthed here and there by the authorities. Sometimes they have political objects, or allege to have them; sometimes they are bands of religious fanatics led astray after some 'Messiah' or 'Virgin' impostor. Once I saw in one jail the 'Holy Ghost,' the 'Virgin Mary,' and the 'Son Jesus' of one of these 'fake' organizations that had turned a whole district upside down. Quite as frequently as not these movements assume the name 'Katipunan.'"

Of the Aglipay schism Mr. Le Roy says:

"Since last August the schism in Roman Catholic ranks has been spreading in the islands. The seriousness and importance of this movement have totally been missed in the United States. It now counts almost half the Christianized population in its ranks, and threatens the complete failure of Msgr. Guidi's mission as a conciliator. Let it be recalled that this 'Philippine Independent Church' was organized and at first spread mainly under the auspices of men not in the past (some of them not now)

well disposed towards the American government; that it began with scenes of disorder and riot over the possession of various churches; above all, that it is really but a new phase of the anti-friar movement, and touches therefore the question that is the tinder of Philippine politics."

38 38 38

AMERICAN FREEMASONRY IS A RELIGION.

It will be news to many of those who scan these pages, to learn that one of the main reasons why the Catholic Church condemns Masonry is that Masonry is a religion. Her condemnations constantly speak of Masons as a sect.

"Precisely," will the advocate of the craft exclaim, "did I not tell you that the Church is ignorant? Masonry as has been asserted over and over again, is a mere social, a mere benevolent society. Its objects are mutual help and assistance. And if you want an authoritative statement on the subject, turn to page 190 of your Ritualist and you will find the express denial that Masonry is a religion." Softly, friend, I answer in reply, let us go more slowly and calmly in the discussion. The case of the Church will not be found to be as bad as you would make it; and though I do not like to plunge at once 190 pages into Mackey's Ritualist, since there are so many interesting things to be found earlier in the little volume, I shall let you have your way and copy in full the passage which contains the assertion that Masonry is not a religion.

It is the charge to the Grand Chaplain on his installation (p. 190):

"Most Reverend Brother, the sacred position of Grand Chaplain has been entrusted to your care, and we now entrust you with the jewel of your office.

"In the discharge of your duties, you will be required to lead the devotional exercises of our Grand Communications, and to perform the sacred functions of your holy calling at our public ceremonies. Though Masonry be not religion, it is emphatically religion's handmaid, and we are sure that in ministering at its altar, the services you may perform will lose nothing of their vital influence because they are practised in that spirit of universal tolerance which distinguishes our institution. The doctrines of morality and virtue which you are accustomed to inculcate to the world, as the minister of God, will form the appropriate lessons you are expected to communicate to your brethren in the Lodge. This profession which you have chosen as your lot in life is the best guarantee that you will discharge the duties of your present appointment with steadfastness and perseverance in well-doing. The Holy Bible, that great light of Masonry, we entrust to your care."

There is no one who does not see that, in the light of its surroundings, the denial that Masonry is religion becomes remark-

ably weak and unemphatic. A grand chaplain, a most reverend brother, sacred functions, holy calling, devotional exercises, ministering at its altar, the entrusting of the Bible, instruction in morality—all these things point evidently to something more than a mere social and benevolent society as we generally apply the terms.

And, in fact, in this very passage, we find coupled with the denial, a remarkable admission: "Masonry is emphatically the handmaid of religion." Of what religion is it the handmaid? we ask. What religion does it "emphatically" serve? It is certainly not the handmaid of Catholicity, and as the emphatic handmaid of any other religion, you certainly can not expect that the Church will favor it or allow her children to belong to it. This very admission, even if we had no others, would stamp Masonry as an organization that Catholics can not patronize, since to embrace the emphatic handmaid of another religion is certainly to jeopardize one's faith. The Church's condemnation of Masonry is not, therefore, the result of ignorance but of knowledge, if Masonry be, as it asserts itself to be, the "emphatic handmaid of religion."

But of what form is it emphatically the handmaid? we again ask, for the idea of Masonry as religion's handmaid is new to us. We were told, and we long believed it, that Masonry was a mere benevolent society. We objected to its oaths, we objected to its secrecy, we had other objections, but we did not imagine that it professed itself the emphatic handmaid of religion. Is it the emphatic handmaid of Prebyterianism, or Methodism, or Quakerism, or any other of the Christian denominations? For we suppose that it at least makes pretence of Christianity, since it commits the Holy Bible to its chaplain's care, and commissions him to impart in the lodge the same moral lessons that he imparts to the world. And yet strangely, no Christian church seems to recognize Masonry as an emphatic handmaid; and Masonry, on its part, though an emphatic handmaid, shows no disposition to acknowledge openly any religious form as mistress.

It is not a handmaid, it is something more. And this indeed its very name implies. It is *Free-Masonry*, acknowledging, as we shall see later, no ties, religious or otherwise, save its own. It is not the servant but the mistress. And truly she would be a strange handmaid who, on the occasion of the solemn festivities of the household, would insist on occupying the place of honor. Yet this is precisely what Masonry does in religious matters, for when on Masonic feast-days, public services are held in a Church, divine service must be performed by the lodge's chaplain.

"In every country where Freemasonry is encouraged," says

the Ritualist, "its festival days are celebrated with great ceremony. These are the festival of St. John the Baptist on the 24th of June and that of St. John the Evangelist on the 27th of December. They are days set apart by the fraternity to *worship* the Grand Architect of the Universe, to implore his blessings upon the great family of mankind and to partake of the feast of brotherly affection. . . . On arriving at the Church gate, the brethren uncover and open their ranks to the right and left as far as the master, who, followed by the brethren, passes between the lines, likewise uncovered, into the Church. . . . *Divine service* MUST be performed by the chaplain and an appropriate address delivered by some competent brother appointed for the occasion. Hymns and anthems adapted to the occasion shall be sung, and after service a collection may be made at the Church doors, in aid of the charity fund." (pp. 200, 201).

Our handmaid has certainly taken the whole matter into her own hands. She institutes her own religious festivals, the brethren unite in worshipping the Grand Architect of the Universe, they meet in a public church, their chaplain celebrates divine service, they sing appropriate hymns and anthems—all this at the bidding and under the control of Masonry, and yet Masonry is not a religion, but only its handmaid! And allow us to enquire what Church is selected for their divine services? Who commissions the chaplain to perform them? Of what nature are the sacred orders that he possesses, or has he any? What is the nature of the services performed and of the worship offered to the Grand Architect of the Universe? Who or what is this Grand Architect of the Universe? The Church is assuredly not Catholic, the chaplain is not Catholic, the worship is not Catholic, so that even if the idea of the Grand Architect of the Universe were Catholic, and in the Masonic sense it is not, the authorities of the Church could no more permit her children to participate in such services than in those of any of the numberless forms of Protestantism that surround us.

Participation in a false worship for a Catholic spells apostasy. By his act he cuts himself off from the spirit and soul of the Church, and you can not in fairness blame her for cutting him off from her external communion as a dead member. It is he and not she that is to blame. Masonry has therefore in it harm and serious harm for a Catholic; for even though, in places where Masonry is not encouraged, it may not ask him to take part in such public un-Catholic services, it is not from lack of desire on its part, but from lack of opportunity. Its spirit is anti-Catholic, for it would, if it could, prescribe to its Catholic members acts which are necessarily for them acts of formal apostasy.

"But after all," it will be said, "you have not proved that Masonry is a distinct religion by itself, for it uses the church of

some denomination or other, probably of that to which the majority of its members belong."

To this we answer: 1st. that we have shown that Masonry is not what it pretends to be, viz: a mere benevolent society, but is, by its own admission, intimately bound up with religion, even styling itself emphatically religion's handmaid.

2nd. We have shown that, while professing its intimate connection with religion, it can show no affiliation with any of the existing forms among us.

3rd. It is not so much the place as the special form of worship that distinguishes religion from religion. Hence we frequently find several Protestant denominations using the same church for services, yet this does not prevent one denomination from being distinct from the other. The selection of a Protestant church, when convenient for Masonic worship is, therefore, no argument against our thesis. Masonry professes itself emphatically religious, though it professes no subjection to any religious form. It unites its members in divine services, in its own divine worship performed by its own chaplain. It is therefore a separate distinct religion.

But let us put this argument more clearly and fully, for the more evidently we prove this, the more evidently will the justice and necessity of the Church's condemnation shine forth. No man can serve two masters in religion. If Masonry be religion, the Catholic must necessarily choose between the Church and it—"to belong to both, to be true to both he can not." Here then is our argument:

That is evidently a distinct religion which has its own altar, its own temple, its own priesthood, its own prayers, its own ceremonies, its own hymns and anthems, its own ritual, its own worship, its own religious festivals, its own consecrations and anointings, its own creed, its own morality, its own theory of the human soul and the relations of that soul with the deity, its own peculiar God. But all these things are found in Masonry. Therefore Masonry is a distinct religion.

We do not think that any man in his right senses will deny our first assertion as to what constitutes a distinct religion, for denial would naturally impose upon him the duty of indicating some element omitted—a task clearly impossible. Indeed we have enumerated many more things than are required for establishing an essential difference between religion and religion. The Jew and the Christian worship the same God; they belong, nevertheless, to different religions. Catholics and Protestants profess belief in the same Christ. A difference of creed and of worship creates an essential distinction between them.

The matter is so plain that we shall not waste time in proof.

The main question then is one of *fact*. Is it a fact that all these things are found in Masonry? We beg the indulgence of the reader's patience while we submit the proof. And pardon too, we crave, for the copiousness, at times, of our quotations; for we prefer to give a little more than is absolutely necessary, in order that we may not be accused of taking expressions apart from their context and wresting them to our own meaning. We want to know sincerely what Masonry says of itself. We are willing to give it the utmost fair play.

As regards the existence of a ritual, the very book which we are studying is a concrete proof; though, as the fact has never been denied, proof is not needed. The existence of special religious festivals, ceremonies, hymns and anthems, we have learned from the preceding quotation (pp. 200, 201). Let us therefore take up the other parts of the enumeration point by point.

The first thing that arrests our attention as we open our Ritualist is the Masonic altar. It is apparently a block of stone with three candlesticks around it. On it rests the open Bible, and on the Bible are the square and compasses. A dark wood, presumably of cypress, is in the back ground (p. 11). This is the altar of the lower degrees, since Masonry has a different altar for the higher ones. On page 35 we are supplied with a diagram showing how the lights should be disposed. The drawing is accompanied by the following admonition:

"Errors are so often made in placing the lights around the altar that the preceding diagram is inserted for the direction of the Senior Deacon whose duty it is to see that they are properly distributed."

And so the altar follows us throughout the whole book from beginning to end. Its form, however, as we stated, changes.

"The altar in a council of Royal and Select Masters," says our Ritualist (p. 532), "represents the celebrated Stone of Foundation in the temple, a notice of which will be found in a subsequent part of this volume. It should, therefore, unlike other Masonic altars, be constructed to represent a cubical stone without other ornaments, and on it should be deposited the Substitute Ark. As the Masonic legend places the Stone of Foundation in the Sanctum Sanctorum of the second temple, but immediately beneath it in the first, and as that point is represented by the ninth arch in a council of Select Masters, it is evident that during a reception, at least, the altar should be placed within the arch, and not as is too often done, outside of it, or even in the center of the room."

Masonry therefore has its own special altars, altars with a special Masonic significance. The arrangement, material, ornamentation are all minutely specified.

THE REAL BOOKER WASHINGTON.

We have heard and read a great deal of late in praise of Mr. Booker Washington, "the great negro philanthropist who is doing more than any other living man or any agency to educate and elevate the colored race in the South." Carnegie's recent donation to Tuskegee Institute, of which Booker is the founder and principal, is lauded by the newspapers as "the most sensible and meritorious of all his many gifts for the uplifting of humanity."

There is another side to this picture. Mr. Gordon McDonald, a distinguished Alabama lawyer, writes over his signature in the *Washington Post*.†)

"Now having demonstrated who is really responsible for the negro appointments in the South, let me turn the searchlight of truth on the renowned Booker and his doings—his real doings. This wonderfully shrewd negro has convinced the naturally glib Northern people that his propaganda is of infinite benefit to the negroes and whites of the South; that the aims and results of his Tuskegee performances are to give young negroes an 'industrial education' and not to incite them to dreams of social equality with the whites; having obtained ponderous words of commendation from the sage of Princeton, and much more valuable cash from Carnegie, Ogden, et als; really fools most of the Southern newspapers. . . . I speak whereof I know, in saying that for one genuine hardworking husbandman or artisan sent into the world by Washington's school, it afflicts this State with twenty soft-handed negro dudes and loafers, who earn a precarious living by 'craps' and petit larceny or live on the hard-earned wages of cooks and washerwomen, whose affections they have been enabled to ensnare. The girls graduated at the school are taught to scorn hard work, while their poor mothers toil over the wash tubs and cookstoves that their daughters may be taught music and painting—God save the mark!—and rustle in fine dresses in miserable imitation of white ladies."

"What Washington teaches by precept is shown in its results on his scholars. What he teaches by example is clear to any man not an idiot by nature or blinded by preference. Example is ever the thoroughest teacher of the young, and the example of Washington is the most disastrous to the rising generation of negroes that can be imagined. It teaches to his deluded pupils that social equality is a possibility and that it is near. They hear of him hobnobbing on terms of perfect equality with the president of this country. They hear of him visiting rich Northerners as a favored and petted guest. They hear of his getting his child

†) We quote from the *Catholic Columbian*, No. 21.

into a fashionable school for white girls in the North. Can any of his friends deny these things with truth?"

The conclusion of Mr. McDonald is that the Tuskegee principal is "leading his people to dream a dream of death and disaster."

Mr. James R. Randall, also a distinguished Southerner, and a good Catholic, says in his comments on this letter in the *Columbian*:

"Booker Washington is, I understand, more white than black, just as Frederick Douglass, who posed as a negro, admitted, in his last days, to a New England lady friend, that he did not have a drop of African blood in his veins, his father having been a white man and his mother an Indian. The smart colored man knows how to 'pull the leg' of rich Northerners, philanthropically inclined. It is estimated that not more than three out of one thousand Tuskegee graduates follow the trades they have been trained to and despise trades."

If this is the real Booker Washington, and if these are indeed the results of his work, he does not deserve the sympathy and praise he has received, even in Catholic circles,*) and it becomes the duty of every honest newspaper to show him up in his true colors.

*) Mr. Randall intimates that among his Catholic sympathizers are such prelates as Archbishop Ireland and Bishop Conaty.

28 28 28

A CONVERTED SOCIALIST.

The Boston *Herald* of May 23rd publishes a remarkable letter from Mr. David Goldstein, who has been prominent in the councils of the Socialist party in the city of Boston and State of Massachusetts, and who has been a candidate for mayor of Boston upon the Socialist ticket.

Mr. G. declares that, "after a lapse of eight years of active work upon the soap-box, on the lecture platform, in debate and in the press in behalf of.....the principles of Socialism; after eight years of work as organizer, executive officer, and candidate of Socialist parties; after eight years of study of the alleged scientific basis of Socialism, namely, Karl Marx's 'Capital,' " he desires to terminate his connection with the Socialist movement, because he has become convinced that "it is not a bona fide political and economic effort, that it would gain political power to the end of dissolving the social, religious, civic, economic, and family relationship which now exists and which have cost man countless ages in upbuilding."

His reasons are briefly: Socialism's attitude of negation to all

that is fundamental in human affairs,—its denial of God, its opposition to the State, its attempt at the disruption of monogamic marriage.

We quote a few paragraphs *verbâtim* :

"After close application to the doctrinaires, their philosophy and their so-called science, I must conclude that the Socialism I was preaching had no basis in fact. . . . It is my conviction that, were the philosophical doctrines applied to a given country, or to the civilized world in general as promulgated by the founders of 'modern scientific revolutionary international Socialism,' namely by Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, by Kautsky and Bebel of Germany; Guesde and De Ville of France; Hyndman and Bax of England; Vandervelde of Belgium; Ferri of Italy, and many others upon the continent of Europe; by Simmons, Herron, Lee, Unterman and others in the United States—the economic justice, even to the degree which exists to-day, would be unknown. That is to say, I am convinced that Socialism as organized internationally stands for the entire breaking down of the individual standards of moral responsibility; that the Socialist philosophy of 'economic determinism' stands for the substitution of religious principles by social standards of ethics set up upon the basis of mere physical satisfactions."

Mr. Goldstein announces that he intends to explain his experiences and convictions more fully in a forthcoming book.



P. HOLZAPFEL AND HIS THESES.

In our No. 16 we printed, faithful to our principle "Audiatur et altera pars," "A Word of Criticism on the Subject of Historical Traditions" from Mr. Bryan J. Clinch, of San Francisco.

Last week we received, in relation thereto, the subjoined communication from an eminent prelate in Munich :

Mr. Clinch's communication is characteristic of the manner in which laymen without historical training are apt to handle historical problems. I shall pass over his comparison between the late venerable Archbishop Kenrick of St. Louis and a newly-baked Franciscan doctor. Msgr. Kenrick, with all his learning and experience, was not a methodically trained historian, having such a command of the offensive and defensive weapons of modern criticism as that possessed by any able young doctor of to-day who has had the benefit of a thorough-going historical *seminar*.

Mr. Clinch's queries with regard to the papal bulls on which P. Heribert Holzapfel's argument against Loreto rests, are so entirely *extra rem* that I can not but express my surprise at seeing

them proposed by a man who wishes to be taken seriously. If a German *doctorand* defends such a thesis before a university faculty and an audience consisting of from two to three hundred scientifically trained scholars, Mr. Clinch, even though he did not attend the promotion, may rest assured that the sources and material employed in the demonstration were absolutely authentic and unobjectionable.

It was my privilege to be present on the occasion of P. Heribert's promotion, and Mr. Clinch will pardon me for saying that the modesty of the defendant as well as his extensive knowledge and cautious criticism afforded me most genuine gratification.

The last question: "Did the Minorite doctor prove the authenticity of the bulls he quoted as well as their existence?" shows Mr. Clinch has not even an elementary knowledge of the problem as such, nor of the manner in which it requires to be critically treated, nor of the sources to be considered.

P. Holzapfel's head professor in history was the renowned Dr. Knöpfler, the continuator of Hefele's 'Conciliengeschichte' and the author of numerous monographs and a splendid manual of Church history. Does Mr. Clinch really imagine that Professor Dr. Knöpfler neglected to inform himself with regard to such elementary points as he adduces in his letter to THE REVIEW, in the guise, as it were, of objections coming from the general lay public?—MSGR. DR. P. M. BAUMGARTEN.

[As the reader will note on another page of this week's REVIEW, Dr. Holzapfel, O. F. M., has already published his thesis on St. Dominic and the Rosary, and it is expected that his other thesis on Loreto, against which so much criticism has been directed, will also soon be put forth in book form, so that every competent scholar will be able to judge of its valor for himself.—A. P.]

28 28 28

WHY SHOULD WOMEN INSURE THEIR LIVES?

The last few years have developed a tendency in some Catholic circles to include women in "society" life, and the insurance reports of New York show the "Catholic Women's Benevolent Legion" and "Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Legion," those of Pennsylvania the "Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association" and the "Womens' Catholic Order of Foresters" as organizations confining their "beneficial" labors to women only. The "Ladies' Catholic Benevolent Association" of Erie, Pa., is also operating in Massachusetts, while the "Catholic Ladies of Ohio," for instance, are a purely local concern, not even reporting to the insurance department, so that it is really impossible to tell how many Cath-

olic women may be interested in these different insurance schemes.

According to present information, all these concerns are operated upon the assessment plan, virtually relying upon the admission of new members to meet the increasing mortality among the older membership, and the fate of most of them (unless radical changes soon take place for putting them on a reliable basis) will not differ from that of so many other assessment companies, "gone, but not forgotten."

However, in view of the comparatively large policies granted by some of these associations (\$1,000 or even more) the question naturally presents itself: Why should women insure?

The regular life insurance companies have within the last five years devoted special attention to the insurance of women. Some of the companies have even established special departments for the cultivation of this field. Under their system, an investment for life insurance becomes simultaneously a sort of savings bank, since the regular policies provide for cash loans, cash surrender values, and cash settlements at stated periods, which in case of endowment policies may be quite a profitable return on the money invested. So there the women may patronize the companies in preference to placing money on interest, or taking chances in building and loan associations.

The same argument does not apply to the Catholic organizations referred to above, who do not issue endowment policies nor guarantee any loans or cash values on their certificates. The "benefit" there is simply a certain (or rather uncertain) amount of money payable to some beneficiary in case of death of the certificate holder. This suggests the question: Why should anyone be financially benefited by the death of a woman?

True, the funeral expenses should be provided for. Yet as a rule, a few hundred dollars would cover that expense, and for a small weekly payment the industrial insurance companies will guarantee a "death benefit" cheaper and more reliable than any "insurance" furnished by these women's associations. There may be isolated cases, where a widow wishes to provide for the education of her children, in case she should not live long enough to complete the same herself, or a married woman may be the sole support of her crippled husband or aged parents, and wish to provide for them by taking insurance on her own life, so as not to leave the dependent ones helpless in case of her death. But barring such cases, (and their number can not be large enough to form even one successful insurance organization in a State), we still wonder: Why do women insure?

Under normal conditions the father is supposed to be the bread-

winner for his family. As no man has a lease on life, it is but proper that he should provide, by taking life insurance, for the continuance of his work, if taken off before having completed it. For that reason the amount of insurance carried should be in proportion to the obligations assumed. (Size of family, etc.)

But women in the majority of cases do not need life insurance in amounts exceeding the cost of a modest funeral. The amount expended for that additional insurance could be devoted more advantageously to other matters. In this article we refer to life insurance furnished on the assessment plan, and if any one can give us good reasons for having that practice extended, we should be interested in knowing them.



MINOR TOPICS.

Those who read in the papers recently that the Catholic ordinary of Sacramento officiated together with an Episcopalian "bishop," in an Episcopalian church, at the funeral of a Protestant and Freemason, will be interested in the Bishop's statement, which we take from the *Sacramento Bee* of April 29th. Msgr. Grace says above his signature :

"This is an answer to the question as to why and how I participated in the obsequies of our lamented fellow citizen, J. B. Wright. He was for many years the personal friend of the late Bishop Manogue and all the Cathedral priests. After the great strike,*) hundreds of Catholic men presented, through Bishop Manogue, myself and other priests, to Mr. Wright, their demand for justice, or plea for mercy, and thus many homes were saved from ruin—many good citizens were retained in our midst. Mr. Wright was ever faithful to the interests of the railroad company, yet had a boundless sympathy for his fellow workmen.

"Therefore, as a mark of my admiration for his noble qualities and as a token of the gratitude due from my people whom he had treated with justice or mercy, I was, through the courtesy of Bishop Moreland and Rev. Mr. Miel, invited to offer a prayer over the silent form of our friend. Bishop Moreland performed the funeral rites according to the Episcopal Church and there was no mixture of ceremonies.

"I participated in the services much the same as the many dignified gentlemen of different beliefs who bowed their heads and listened to the solemn words of Holy Scripture. The prayer I said is the last of those that follow the Litany of the Saints and is offered for the consolation of the living and the rest of the dead. Catholics can and do, often, kneel at the coffin of their Protestant neighbor, and say that same prayer.

"This is the first time in the history of our State that an Epis-

*) On the Southern Pacific R. R., of which Mr. Wright was Division Superintendent.

copal and Catholic Bishop stood side by side, praying over all the precious mortality of a dear friend. But the occasion was a rare one and may not occur again. However, if the action of all concerned will beget kindlier feelings no one will thank God more than I."

The Episcopalian "bishop," Mr. Moreland, in a statement published together with that of Msgr. Grace in the *Sacramento Bee*, says that "the meeting of two bishops of different communions at the funeral of a prominent citizen, each with his attendant priest, and each taking part in the religious service, is a fact of much interest."

True. But that interest among Catholics, if one of the participating bishops is a real, Catholic bishop, and the other a usurping schismatic, and the place of meeting a schismatical church, must be decidedly of the mortifying and regretful kind.†)

"We make no comment on the Bishop's explanation," says Dr. Lambert in the *Freeman's Journal* (No. 3647), "but we do not think it will meet with general approval. The sight of a Catholic prelate at religious obsequies being sandwiched in between an Episcopalian Bishop and an Episcopalian minister is new to Catholic eyes to look at without winking."

Even the *Western Watchman* (No. 29) protests: "We fear Bishop Grace, of Sacramento, has committed a serious breach of discipline in taking part with an Episcopalian bishop in the obsequies of a prominent citizen of his episcopal city. . . . The Bishop should not have signed his letter: 'Bishop Grace.' He should not have said that prayer for the dead in English. He should not have said it at all in a Protestant burial service."

†) "Noverit (episcopus)," says the Second Plenary Council of Baltimore, "se exemplar sublimi collocatum, ad cujus normam caeteri homines mores suos vivendique rationem componant oportet." Tit. iii, cap. 2,



How deeply poor "Tom" McGrady has fallen, appears from his fearful and wonderful invective against Bishop Brondel, published in the *American Labor Union Journal* of Helena, Mont., No. 32. He contemptuously refers to His Lordship as "Mr." Brondel, calls him "a professional liar" who "lives on the fat of the earth at the expense of poor Irish and German Catholics," prates of Pope "Leo's mistakes" and alleges that "the Catholic Church is the most despotic organization that ever cursed the earth." The bishops in general he charges with having "completely repudiated the teachings of primitive Christianity," with "having been the enemies of science" who "stood for darkness and ignorance and crime," and who "have encouraged free love among the clergy" and grown "wealthy on the imposition of taxes paid for the privilege of sacerdotal concubinage."

THE REVIEW was the first, and for a while the only, Catholic journal that fought this poor deluded man when he prostituted his priestly office in an unworthy cause. No one can regret his terrible self-degradation more sincerely than we. May God give him grace to see whither he is drifting and what the end must be of the career upon which he has entered.

From McGrady's article above quoted we are almost forced to

conclude that the Rev. T. J. Hagerty, formerly of the Diocese of Santa Fe, who has also for several years preached Socialistic errors in various Western cities, is going the same way, though his name still appears in the current Catholic Directory. A few weeks ago we had an enquiry about this priest from Germany, where his lectures are employed by Social-Democratic agitators as weapons against the Catholic Centre party. As unfrocked ex-priests such poor wretches can not do nearly as much harm as they are able to do while "in good standing." It is to be sincerely hoped for the good of the Catholic cause that they will either do penance and strive to repair the harm they have done, or be forced to doff the cloth and appear in their true colors, like poor McGrady.

A Scripps-McRae cablegram announces that Msgr. O'Connell is going to go to Rome to complain to the Holy Father about the hostility of the German Catholics of the United States against the Catholic University. The Berlin *Germania* the other day reported that Dr. von Funk of Tübingen had refused a call to the institution presided over by Msgr. O'Connell. Are the German Catholics of America to be held responsible for the fact that the University is unable, in consequence of the treatment accorded some years ago to Dr. Pohle and Msgr. Schröder, to obtain the services of any Catholic scholar of reputation in Germany? As for the alleged hostility of the German element, we are sure it exists only, barring a few professional hotspurs of the *Western Watchman* kidney, in the imagination of the reverend gentleman who has lately been sent here by the Pope to make the the University a success. *There is no hostility against the University among the German element.* If Msgr. O'Connell believes there is a lack of cooperation, it is his business to ascertain the causes of such apathy and to make an honest and energetic attempt to remove them. If, instead, he would go to Rome to complain, this would simply prove that he is incompetent to hold the important and difficult office with which he has been entrusted.

Speaking of the new press law in Pennsylvania, about which the daily newspapers all over the country have made such a fuss, the *Pittsburg Observer* (No. 51) says that there is nothing in its terms which would prevent any honest and decent newspaper from making such comments upon legislative measures or upon the official acts of State, municipal, county or other officers, as are proper for the information of the public or in the line of legitimate public discussion. No honestly conducted newspaper need have any apprehension as to the effects of the new law. In fact our contemporary declares that "Catholics would have gladly welcomed a measure much more comprehensive in its scope. They would have hailed with satisfaction the enactment of a law which would effectively 'muzzle' the unwholesome, the degrading, the baleful sensationalism which invariably characterizes the deliberately long-drawn-out accounts published with evident gratification by the daily press of all sorts of crime, but particularly of wrong-doing of an immoral (the *Observer* means to say indecent or obscene) and of a murderous description."

At the suggestion of Archbishop Bruchesi, the City Council of Montreal has rescinded the resolution by which it had previously accepted Mr. Carnegie's offer to establish a free library there. Difficulties connected with the choice of a site and with the two languages—French being "official" in the province of Quebec as well as English—were made the excuse for finally rejecting the offer. But the real reasons were, municipal pride which refused to accept a present from a foreign nabob under conditions imposed by him; and the refusal of the library committee to allow the religious authorities a voice in the selection of books for the proposed library. The majority of the City Council of Canada's commercial metropolis have acted wisely in following the Archbishop's advice to reject the Carnegie offer under the circumstances. We only wish some of our American cities had as much civic pride as to follow Montreal's example.



In a memoir of the late Bishop Amherst, just published, the Bishop's views about ecclesiastical music are expressed with much candor. Upon hearing Mozart's "Twelfth Mass" on Easter Day, the Bishop exclaims: "How this kind of thing carries me back to old times; and how infinitely I prefer the quiet, ecclesiastical, and devout manner of singing and kind of music at Northampton and Birmingham! It is most distasteful to me to see the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass shattered, as it were, into fragments, and made a succession of pegs on which to hang a series of musical performances. Number Twelve is not, it is true, so offensive as some figured masses from its choral character, but still the Holy Sacrifice has to *wait* for it and the ministers to sit bored on benches, while the ears of the audience, heaven save the mark! are tickled, and their concert-loving propensities gratified."



The Pope, to-day, would content himself with a slice of territory on the left side of the Tiber, which would give the Vatican free communication with the port of Cività Vecchia. This territory is to be erected into a pontifical principality under the protection of five great powers: Germany, England, Austria, Russia, and the United States.

Such is, if we may believe *La Vérité Française* (No. 3572), the program of the German Catholics, and the writer adds: "They will carry it out because they are firmly determined. As for Italy, it will be sufficient for the Kaiser to say to Victor Emmanuel: *Sic volo! sic jubeo!*"

A beautiful day-dream!



The *Catholic Telegraph*, which has recently been devoting much valuable space to the doings of Catholic truth societies, complains in its No. 20 that the Cincinnati branch "is doing absolutely nothing practical." Will not the *Telegraph* give the members a good example? So long as that delectable sheet helps to undo the work of the Catholic Truth Society by liberally advertising a work like the Encyclopaedia Britannica, which has contributed

so much to poisoning the wells of public opinion with anti-Catholic bias, we fear we need not expect much from Cincinnati.

Our Liberals don't even respect the monks if they are canonized. We read in the *Western Watchman* of May 24th: "Prof. Starbuck refers in the *Boston Review* to the gross slanders published by St. Bernard on the great Saint William of York. This good monk in his life of St. Malachy has a good deal to say against the clergy of Ireland. St. Bernard was a dear saint and one of the greatest souls the Church ever produced; but he was an aggravated case of monk turned statesman."

The Chicago *Courier de l'Ouest* announces that, beginning June 24th, it purposes to issue a daily edition entitled *Le Petit Journal de Chicago*. If the *Courier* itself were a live and sound Catholic newspaper, we should hail its development into a daily with joy. As it is, we wonder why the number of inane and colorless French dailies is to be multiplied. Surely it can not be with the hope of great financial returns.

"It seems there is scarcely any *via media* between intemperance and total abstinence in the United States. Perhaps it is best so."—*Western Watchman* (No. 27).

The writer of these lines has made a false induction, as all are apt to do who jump to general conclusions from limited observations within their own narrow circle.

Dom Fournier, of Solesmes, presents as the result of long-continued and deep researches, a catalog of canonized persons who have practised the gentle art of healing. The list contains no less than sixty-eight names, including several women. St. Luke, the patron of the medical profession, heads the curious roster.

We are asked to publish that a Catholic applicant who possesses the necessary qualifications would stand a good chance of obtaining the position of superintendent of the Delphos (Ohio) public schools. Salary about \$1,200 a year. Let the candidate apply to the Delphos Board of Education, Delphos, Ohio.

Marlier & Co. of Boston send us the first number of a new monthly magazine, *L'ame française*. The contents are not of a character to convince us that it will either fill a long-felt want or find a sufficiently large circle of subscribers to insure its future.

A further paper on the "Roman Catholic Clerical Aid Fund," by our insurance editor, had to be laid over for next week's issue.

